

“The Case For Libertarian Fascism,” Taleed Brown
Transcript ([Video](#)):

That Guy T: I’d argue that this has been one of my most successful shitposts ever. So if you don’t follow me on Twitter, A. you should, B. you probably need some background to understand the context of this video. Recently I garnered some attention over a statement I made on Twitter, that statement being “I might be a fascist.” The statement originally was intended to be a sort of parody of a statement made by Milo Yiannopoulos in late 2015 where he said “I think I might be an anarcho-capitalist.” I think literally only two people picked up on that, but it’s whatever, alright? The point is: it was a shitpost. But that didn’t stop a lot of people from taking it very, very seriously.

In addition to the usual anti-anti-sjw crowd, this also included quite a few left libertarians who took it upon themselves to start writing my professional associates, warning them that “you may have a fascist in your midst.” Thankfully, none of my associates were silly enough to take it seriously in the first place, but as a courtesy to the artist (?), I figured I’d give him some peace of mind. So I quoted my original tweet with “Just to clarify, I’m not actually a fascist, just a very principled libertarian who’s ready to start winning. Fashies are friends.” I assumed the wording of that sentence, including the term “fashies” would make it pretty obvious that, you know, I might be fucking around. But no, in fact, it made people even more confident in their assumption that I was a closet fascist, so much so that I even garnered the attention of TJ Kirk, the Amazing Atheist, who made a video responding to my Tweets:

TJ Kirk: *“Sexual degeneracy — oooo”.*

That Guy T: We’ll take a look at that a little later. But since everybody decided to take this so seriously, I figured I’d, you know, try to rationalize the position of libertarian fascism. Yeah, it may be silly, and the lay (?) intellectuals get to say “oh you’re so stupid, do you even know what fascism is? Ugh, read a book.”

But honestly, you know, who cares? The discussion is fun and interesting, you know, at least to me. I never understood why people limit philosophical thought to studying and preserving old established historical concepts, when it’s so much fun to theorize new ones. Personally, I think it’s because people care more about appearing book smart in front of their peers, versus engaging and thinking about ideas. But, you know, that’s an aside. Let’s see where this thought experiment takes us.

So, libertarian fascism, also known as anarcho-fascism, or alt-capitalism is a concept philosophy that’s been around for a few years. The primary reason for this ideology’s existence is to direct a defensible and sustainable libertarian framework. Libertarian being defined as a means of avoiding or resolving conflict over scarce resources, not socially- liberal, fiscally-conservative marriage-equality, “420 blaze it bro.”

Things such as private property norms, free association and disassociation, limited commons, self-defense, which doesn't exclude collective defense, and many other things, including the invaluable yet massively abused principle of individualism, which we'll get to later in the video. The libertarian means, also, however, have to be exploitable by right authoritarians. Now, I know what you're thinking: "T, what are you talking about, dude? Libertarian, authoritarian — they're antonyms, bro. I mean, have you ever even taken a political competence test?"

I get it. And you're right, largely, authoritarianism is in direct contradiction to libertarian principles, with a few nuanced exceptions, such as sovereign property management, and physical removal of non-compliant parties. You know, trespassers, murderers, rapists, assertive communists, islamists, and even some fascists. So you're probably wondering how an alliance between fascists and libertarians would be possible, or even considerable. The answer lies in the commonality that libertarians share with fascists. These commonalities are not in methodology, so save your breath if you're going to try to attribute guilt for Hitler's Holocaust, or Mussolini's Italian Libya. I'm not suggesting that we relaunch another failed sociopathic attempt at ethnic cleansing. So that argument is not an argument.

The commonalities that I revert to are social demands that can be peacefully achieved through private property norms. Things like ethnic homogeneity or separatism within world (?) borders, which can be achieved through sovereign property management, including economic and social incentive structures. Hierarchical leadership, which coincides with the anarcho-capitalist notion of voluntary hierarchy. Nationhood, not to be confused with nation-state, which is only secure through self-ownership and desirable associations. You know, basically, unmolested identity. These cultural market demands, you know, whether you agree with them or not, do not inherently contradict private property norms. However, the demands of philosophical leftism do directly contradict these norms. This is another commonality that libertarians and fascists share, in opposition to Marxism. Concepts like egalitarianism, hyper inclusivity, deductive hierarchy, involuntary collectivism, socialized liberal commons — these things are incompatible with private property norms. Egalitarianism destroys organic competition and congregation. Hyper-inclusivity abolishes separatism and breeds tribal warfare, you know, things like multiculturalism. Socialized liberal commons, I think is self-explanatory. I mean, do we really desire expanded universal ownership over scarce resources? The greatest threat to liberty, and in turn, a peaceful coexistence, and limitation of suffering among individuals worldwide is leftism.

There's a reason why late libertarian philosopher like Ludwig Von Mises, someone who escaped ethnic persecution in Nazi Germany yielded credit to fascism for saving Europe, while the late Friedrich Hayek complemented the Pinochet dictatorship with disapproval, of course, of his totalitarian brutality, for his dedication to securing a liberal market order, and defending his citizens from the plague of socialism. Now I know a lot of you are probably wondering to yourselves, "Okay, T, you're talking all this big game about social demands, and things like that, but what about the economics front?" Well, it's no secret that fascists generally, historically aren't big fans of free market capitalism. And to be honest it's something that they would have

to, in a sense, get over, in considering an alliance to peacefully resolve our conflicts. I mean, it's just not a lengthy debate worth having. You can't fight against the social indoctrinations of Marxism while advocating his economics. Because economics are the driving influence of human action. Just, leave it at that.

So that summarizes the first argument for libertarian fascism. A common opposition against the left.

The second trait is the social responsibility required for maintaining a libertarian social order. Now, most of the norms will tell you that libertarianism is made possible by just leaving people alone. Just pursue your own self-interest, you know, non-aggression, mind your own business. Basically just a live and let live attitude. This is a very juvenile and simplistic understanding of what it takes to create a libertarian society. By all admittance, i used to hold this position as well. And to tackle this point, let's take a look at **TJ's video**, which is an impressive demonstration of a truly basic bitch comprehension of libertarianism:

***TJ:** "Alright, so I don't have a lot of time to make this video, I don't really need a whole lot of time to make this video either. Let's just get right into it. That Guy T, who I guess is a popular YouTuber, got about 100,000 subscribers, said some interesting shit on his Twitter recently. I don't know what tweet he's responding to here, but he says 'just to clarify, I'm not actually a fascist, just a very principled libertarian who's ready to start winning. Fashies are friends.'" Ugh, okay. Let's delve a little deeper into that. "Fascism doesn't mean racism either. Google is a touch screen swipe in reach, friend. Was Hitler a fascist in your view? Possibly, it could be construed that he held fascist tendencies, but not a strong correlation, I would say. There was no necessity to ally with Communists, and it's not necessary to ally with fascists, but it is a strategy I'm willing to consider. I'm saying, again, the focus should be on defeating the left." Okee then. Cue the clip:*

'Uh oh. Retard alert.'

Retard alert everybody. Retard fucking alert."

That Guy T: Okee dokee. Guess — cue the clip again:

"Not an argument, that's not an argument. That's not an argument."

***TJ** "This guy is going around saying I'm a very principled libertarian and I'm considering allying myself with fascists because the most important thing is defeating the left. So first of all, libertarianism means we want to maximize personal liberty. We want people to have as much freedom as is possible for society to still function."*

That Guy T: Let's assume that, for the sake of time, that this is a fair representation of the libertarian position. How does my focus on eliminating leftism contradict that stated mission of extreme liberty? Hint: it doesn't.

TJ *"You know, we think that people shouldn't need a permit to go do this, or that. We think that people should be able to do whatever the fuck they want, basically. People should have maximum personal freedom."*

That Guy T: Again, simplistic as fuck. Libertarianism is not against permits, or licensing, or rules, or regulations. Libertarianism is specifically against these things being centralized via violent monopoly, and enforced onto non-consenting parties, especially through negation of sovereign private property rights. You know, because that incites conflict, and libertarianism is about reducing conflict. If you need a refresher on that, just go and watch the beginning of this video.

TJ: *"Fascism means the opposite of that. That means we want rigid state control of every aspect of a person's life possible. We don't believe in personal freedom, we think personal freedom. We think personal freedom is fucking stupid."*

That Guy T: Not quite. Granted, I'm not very well versed in the historical complexities of fascism, so if i make a mistake, feel free to correct me. But to my understanding, fascism, at least as in wartime, arose in response to a collective market demand for military involvement. And the state was used as an influence towards a common goal of promoting statist militarism. This included authoritarian social conditioning, market controls, and violence against dissidents. However, the means of using a tool to influence the common goal isn't synonymous with authoritarianism. A libertarian fascist society could very well use the tool of private property to influence a common goal of promoting capitalism and cultural preservation. The centers or threats to this common goal could be extinguished through economic disincentives, or disassociation. It's kind of like saying the redistribution of wealth to help the poor necessitates communism. Which is nonsense, because we have this little thing called charity and trade. To put it more clearly, if the means equalled the redistribution of wealth, and the goal equalled helping the poor, authoritarianism isn't necessary to initiate those means to attain the goal. Now I'm sure some of you may be wondering if that's an argument for communism being just as capable of volunteerism as fascism. Unfortunately, not. I don't want to spend too much time on this, so basically, both communism and fascism as political ideologies arised to service a demand. The demand of communism is inherently authoritarian, whereas the demands of fascism are preferably authoritarian. But let's move on.

TJ: *"These two ideologies, if you did a Venn Diagram of all they had in common, those two circles would be about 12 million miles apart."*

That Guy T: I debunked this earlier when I laid out the commonalities between fascism and libertarianism.

TJ: *"There's no fucking intersection there. But it's ok, because the most important thing is defeating the left. Even though I'm a very principled libertarian, who very strongly believes in personal freedom, I'm willing to put that aside, as long as we can defeat the fucking left."*

That Guy T: No, TJ. It's not me putting freedom aside. It's not like I'm just kicking principles to the curb. I'm evaluating my principles, propositioning all of those who I suspect could find agreement in those principles, and attempting to formulate a temporary, mutually beneficial coalition. It's not hypocrisy. It's not dog whistling or subversion. It's strategy.

TJ: *"If any political fucking ideology has ever been defeated, as if there's ever been a point when someone's been like 'liberalism, I've been a liberal for a while now, and I'm just quitting.' And not only that person doing it, but the entirety of all liberals just saying 'You know what, nahhh. We were wrong. You guys were right, Libertarianism/Fascism. That's the true way to go. We all need to join together as libertarian fascists. What?!'"*

That Guy T: Now, see. This is the cutest thing I've ever fucking seen. TJ thinks we're trying to convince leftists to stop being leftists. [Laughs]. Oh my god. Aren't you in for a surprise. The left has made it very clear that there is no convincing them through argumentation. You guys are not willing to engage in negotiating conflict resolutions. This has been proven through the left's brutal and feral demonstrations against free speech and civil discourse on college campuses, in addition to their abundance of dishonesty and corruption in media, and other platforms where you would expect one to discuss these ideas. Leftists have unfortunately made it very clear that there are no arguments to be made. That they will continue to push for more state infringements on our liberties. And they will continue to burden our children with more and more debt. That they will continue to push for social demonization of our views.

This isn't about trying to convince the left to change their ways anymore. Okay? We are well beyond the point of "pweeze no steppy." Alright? This is about unifying a populist right wing majority against you so that you and your political representatives, and your corporate and academic institutions will be subjugated to the survival of Western Civilization whether you like it or not, and if you refuse to peacefully enter the realm of enlightenment, rationality, and non-aggression, or that we get into the beautiful theory of Hoppian (?) physical removal. The greatest lie that leftists ever sold free societies is the idea that democracy is a legitimate and effective means of peaceful conflict resolution among conflicting ideologies, when in reality, it's simply an excuse to justify what tyrants of the past could not.

TJ: *"That's not a thing, you fucking retard. There is no libertarian fascism."*

That Guy T: Not yet, but we are crowd funding for helicopters.

TJ: *"You might as well be a Jewish Nazi. You might as well be Donald Trump, when he recently said 'I'm both a nationalist, and a globalist.'" No, you're not, retard. You can't be both those*

fucking things. Some things are just mutually fucking exclusive. Like, you can't be like "i'm a rapist, but i'm also a really good person. No! No! You have to choose, bitch."

That Guy T: Funny, I would say the same thing about Marxists. Now, this video is just TJ yelling spastically to maintain the attention of his 12-year-old audience, but he makes one more point that I think serves as a good introduction for my final argument for libertarian fascism. That being the topic of individualism.

TJ: *"The Weimar Republic, which is what Germany was prior to the Nazi takeover, and who slapped the Weimar era with the label of degeneracy? It was the fucking Nazis. They didn't like the art that was being created at that time. They thought like "oo Cubism, oh shit, scary, this would be the end of fucking society if we let people do fucking Cubism and Dada and shit. And they also didn't like that people were fucking. They didn't like all the sexual degeneracy. Ooo. Sexual degeneracy. It's so scary. You'd think a libertarian would be all for sexual degeneracy. You'd think a libertarian would be like "stick your dick in whatever you want, as long as it's adult and consenting."*

That Guy T: You're right, TJ. This would be the assumed libertarian position on sexual promiscuity, particularly thanks to the libertine degenerates masquerading as left-libertarians or market anarchists. If you ask the Cathy Reisenwitz corner of the movement, eliminating the social stigma surrounding condomless polyamory is more important than taxation. Feminist sexual liberation has coincided with, if not directly caused quite a few negative cultural phenomena, many of which are toxic to society. Things like single motherhood, the destruction of nuclear family structure, you know, leading to increased welfare statism. High STD rates. Demonization of sexual responsibility. Et cetera. The notion that sexual liberation should face no criticism from libertarians because it's voluntary is both mainstream and pathetic. Granted, it obviously shouldn't be met with aggression. I'm not arguing to brand thots in the public square with hot iron, but this type of pacifist individualism that's been adopted by libertarians and many other people is a complete bastardization of the principle. Individualism is invaluable, and the agency of the individual should be respected. But respect isn't synonymous with silence or non-intervention.

One positive aspect of fascism that I think libertarians lack is a sense of loyalty or sense of responsibility to creating a better society, to preserve or improve the future through virtue. Many libertarians have completely abandoned this for a sense of nihilistic egocentrism. They've been made to believe that the only virtue they should offer to society is tolerance, is a very common trend among libertarian youth, specifically in America. It's literally become a libertine movement, using libertarianism as a shield against social ostracization. If the only wisdom or intellectual gift that you feel motivated or permitted to contribute to the world is liberty, then you're kind of admitting that you don't care about the world. I know that may sound shocking to hear coming from a very principled libertarian, you know, a fucking An-Cap. But think about it. The future of your civilization is dependent on the fundamental ideals and morals that you preserve. You know, like the survival of a nation rests in the will of its citizens. Not only what you preach, but

also what you practice. If you want to be healthy, or want others to be healthy, you have to do more than simply say "eat whatever you want, just don't violate the nap (?), bro." It takes work, it takes discipline. Most of all, it takes resilience and determination, a passion for greatness.

To put this in perspective, think of society as if it were your daughter. You have the capacity and burden to raise this child. To instill in them the necessary virtues to carry on your legacy. To make the world into something that your grandchildren, and your grandchildren's grandchildren will love. Are you telling me the only virtue you would instill in your daughter is "freedom?" What kind of parent would you be if the only intellectual investment that you made into the continuation of human consciousness was "freedom?"

Well, sweetie, if you want to smoke meth, you know, smoke meth. If you want to drink bacon grease, drink bacon grease. If you want to adopt and promote a self-destructive philosophy that has contributed to the suffering of 100s of millions throughout history, hey, "just free speech, man. Just be free."

Do you think that your child would be equipped to survive. Do you think that you would have done everything in your capacity to ensure the survival of this concept of liberty that you love so much. Is freedom honestly the only thing that you would want for your daughter. Are you telling me that you hold no preference between this, and this? So long as she's free?

We as individuals have a destined obligation to construct the society that we want. To deny that obligation is simply cowardice. If you're not willing to criticize bad actions and openly promote what is necessarily for the survival of the people whom are expected to carry the torch of liberalism into the future? Do you even care about the survival of the idea in the first place? If you have no interest in the wellbeing or prosperity of the demographic or social order that maintains freedom, how am I supposed to believe that you value freedom at all? Demographics matter. And I'm not going all forcing (?) 88 on you. I don't believe that only 1% pure barbarian (?) phenotypes are capable of cherishing these principles, and that all other participants in this triathlon we call human existence are doomed to eternal moral inferiority and savagery. I believe that a society that values freedom should serve as a bastion for the rest of the world. I don't believe people should be condemned to isolation simply because of their ancestry. But I also believe that a free society is easily abused, and that in order to preserve the social order, we're going to need to ensure the survival of our demographics. Not only genetically, but culturally, and ideologically. Homogeneity doesn't really benefit society if it's filled with Communists. This would be, in my opinion, one of the strengths of libertarian fascism, securing a free society via collective investment and determination in the preservation of our principles, whereas modern libertarianism is just about being a suicidal philanthropist. If we just expand the commons, and open borders to leftists, we'll have a free and peaceful society. Tolerating intolerance is no different from cucking immorality (?). And valuing the liberty to destroy liberty as equal to the liberty to preserve liberty is no different from surrendering to aggression. Left-libertarians and black flag anarchists may not overtly declare an opposition to a free society, but they're pretty damn useless when it comes to pursuing or maintaining one. If fascists are willing to assist in

pushing back against this wave of cultural Marxism that left libertarians are complicit in endorsing, I mean, who am I to deny a soldier his rifle.

The right seeks to bring peace to the world through negotiation and cooperation. Through trade and mutual benefit. Through abstinence and defense. Through property. Left seeks to do so through intersectionality and communalism. Through aggression and liberation from living standards which inconvenience their moralist crusade. Through what can only be described as enslavement. Of course left and right aren't strict boxes in which everyone fits perfectly into. Obviously [garbled] there are nuances and overlaps. Someone can value traits of one, while valuing traits of the other. So don't give me the "world isn't (?) black and white" argument, because the intended use of these terms isn't to suggest that it is. The intention is to characterize specific elements of philosophical action.

It's time that we admit the truth. The principles of libertarianism: free markets, private property, and self ownership, are not meant to be these morally relative concepts, or optional. These ethics are non-negotiable. Now, every individual is endowed agency by their nature of being an individual. But if you're unwilling to resolve conflict via mutual respect for the agency of others, then your agency, your individualism, and in turn, your rights, are forfeited. And at that point, peace through coexistence is rendered impossible. But that's just me.

I mean, this whole thing started off as a fucking troll, but if I'm being honest, I think I might have convinced myself. Be sure to let me know what you think in the comments section below. Really looking forward to reading that.

And also, I'd like to give a huge thanks to my Patrons, and my PayPal donors. You know, I've recently decided to cut AdSense completely completely from my channel due to its now virtually non-existent income stream. I'd much rather rely on direct donations from my fans, those who enjoy my work, and you know, assist other kinds of creators through purchasing services like YouTube Red. Even the smallest donation of \$2 a month, or even \$0.25 a month goes a really long way, and I want all of you guys to know that I really really appreciate it. And thanks for watching.